



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/936,872	09/17/2001	Ekapot Bhunachet	P01619	9445
<div>7590 08/22/2007 MR. ERKAPOT BHUNACHET 2-32-22 KASUGA, TSUKUBA IBARAKI, 305-0821, JAPAN</div>			<div>EXAMINER ROZANSKI, MICHAEL T</div>	
			<div>ART UNIT 3768</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>
			<div>MAIL DATE 08/22/2007</div>	<div>DELIVERY MODE PAPER</div>

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/936,872

Applicant(s)

BHUNACHET, EKAPOT

Examiner

.Michael Rozanski

Art Unit

3768

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael Rozanski.(3) Paul Sadler.(2) Eleni Mantis-Mercader.(4) Ekapot Bhunachet.

Date of Interview: 10 August 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 34-40.

Identification of prior art discussed: MacAulay et al (5,590,660), Longacre (4,535,758), Alfano et al (6,665,556).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant asserts that invention is not obvious over prior art discussed because the results obtained were not predictable. Regarding claim 35 and dependents, Examiner suggests to submit an affidavit that substantially and accurately demonstrates that results were not predictable.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


ELENI MANTIS MERCADER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required